UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/530,489	06/26/2007	Giacomo Stefano Roba	05788.0346-00000	5293	
	7590 03/04/200 ENDERSON, FARAE	9 BOW, GARRETT & DUNNER	EXAMINER		
LLP			MOONEY, MICHAEL P		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2883		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/04/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		89	ROBA ET AL.				
		r	Art Unit				
	MICHAE	L P. MOONEY	2883				
The MAILING DATE of this commu Period for Reply	nication appears on th	e cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N - Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum s - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for repl Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF T s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e munication. tatutory period will apply and v y will, by statute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNICATION vent, however, may a reply be tir vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this common (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on 10 December '	วกดล					
2a) This action is FINAL .	2b)⊡ This action is i						
'	<i>'</i> —		osecution as to the	e merits is			
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	,	,					
·	ne application						
·—	Claim(s) <u>53-112</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
8) Claim(s) 53-112 are subject to resti	iction and/or election	requirement					
o) Claim(s) <u>33-772</u> are subject to restr	iction and/or election	requirement.					
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office actions.	or documents have been documents have been documents have been documents documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receive lle 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Upon further analysis of the claims, it has been determined that a replacement restriction requirement will provide additional clarity. The 10/28/08 restriction requirement is hereby withdrawn and replaced by that which appears below.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 53-93 and 106-112, drawn to optical fiber device/method classified in,
 e.g., class 385, subclass 128 (also 522/90 and 427/163.2).
- II. Claims 94-105 drawn to a radiation curable composition classified in class 522,subclass 1+.

Inventions II and I are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a curable composition used on other surfaces such as, e.g., a flat substrate and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

Art Unit: 2883

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include

(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Page 4

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

<u>Furthermore, if Applicant chooses to elect Invention I, Applicant is further required to elect either one of the following two species:</u>

Species A drawn to an optical fiber device/method with a coating composed an ethylinically unsaturated polyurethane, etc. (e.g., class 522 subclass 90).

Species B drawn to an optical fiber device/method having a coating/method-of-using-said-coating that may not have at least one ethylenically unsaturated polyurethane etc. (e.g., classes 385/123, 128; 427/163.2).

The above species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species A corresponds to claims 68-93, 112.

Species B corresponds to claims 53-67 and 106-111.

The following claim(s) are generic: currently no claim is generic to all of the claims.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Species A refers to an ethylinically unsaturated polyurethane, etc. Species B refers to a coating/method-of-using-said-coating that may not have at least one ethylenically unsaturated polyurethane etc.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2883

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL P. MOONEY whose telephone number is 571-272-

2422. The examiner can normally be reached during weekdays, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael P. Mooney/ Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2883 /Frank G Font/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2883

FGF/mpm 2/28/09

Application/Control Number: 10/530,489

Art Unit: 2883

Page 7